



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,808	09/15/2003	Yutaka Ochi	P69141US0	7384
	7590 08/06/2007 OLMAN PLLC	•	EXAM	IINER
400 SEVENTH STREET, N. W. WASHINGTON, DC 20004		XIAO, KE		
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20004		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2629	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/06/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		1 A 12 45 N1 .	A all a set a			
Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/661,808	OCHI ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Ke Xiao	2629			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication a or Reply	ppears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	CORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUN 1.136(a). In no event, however, may not will apply and will expire SIX (6) Migute, cause the application to become	NICATION. a reply be timely filed  DNTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status	•					
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18	June 2007.				
2a)⊠	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice unde	r <i>Ex par</i> te Quayle, 1935 C	.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposit	ion of Claims					
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1 and 3 is/are pending in the applic	ation.				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1 and 3</u> is/are rejected.					
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
9)[	The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner.				
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a	ccepted or b) Dobjected t	o by the Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	he drawing(s) be held in abey	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	•				
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attach	ed Office Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docume		§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
	2. Certified copies of the priority docume		Application No			
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the pr	riority documents have bee	en received in this National Stage			
	application from the International Bure	eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
* ;	See the attached detailed Office action for a li	ist of the certified copies no	ot received.			
Attachme		<b>.</b>	(DTO 442)			
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		v Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date			
3) Info	rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Other:	f Informal Patent Application			

Application/Control Number: 10/661,808

Art Unit: 2629

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Tanaka (US 6,052,112).

Regarding **Claim 1**, the AAPA teaches a method of driving a vertically aligned. liquid crystal display (AAPA, Figs. 8 and 9) comprising the steps of:

dividing one field into a plurality of subfields including at least a first subfield shorter than a given period for which an output light of a liquid crystal varies from a white level that is a saturated level (AAPA, Fig. 9 1F into subfields B0-B5, B0 is shorter than the given period), to a black level and a second subfield longer than the given period (AAPA, Fig. 9 subfields B2 and B3 together can make up one subfield which is longer than said period), the first subfield having one display-off period for which the liquid crystal is not driven and one display on period for which the liquid crystal is driven (AAPA, Fig. 9 subfield B0) and the second subfield having a plurality of display off periods for which the liquid crystal is not driven and a plurality of display on period for which the liquid crystal is driven (AAPA, Fig. 9 subfields B2 and B3), each display off period of the second subfield being shorter than the given period, the display off period

of the first subfield being equal to each of the display off periods of the second subfield (AAPA, Fig. 9 all display off periods are equal); and

supplying at least a saturated drive voltage as a digital drive signal to the liquid crystal for each display on period to modulate light incident in the liquid crystal (AAPA, Figs. 8 and 9, Vp).

The AAPA fails to teach that the ratio of the display on periods of all the subfields to the one field being in the range of 1:6 to 5:6. Tanaka teaches such a ratio for any subfield scheme gradation display including liquid crystal displays (Tanaka, Fig. 3, Col. 16 lines 55-65). It would have been obvious to use the overlapped driving scheme of Tanaka as opposed to the generate subfield driving scheme of the AAPA in order to improve gradation image quality of moving images (Tanaka, Col. 5 lines 50-55).

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Tanaka (US 6,052,112) as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Chen (US 2003/0080931).

Regarding Claim 3, the AAPA in view of Tanaka fails to teach a step of supplying a voltage larger than the saturated drive voltage to the liquid crystal. Chen teaches increasing the voltage supplied during a transition from a low state to a high state above than the saturated drive voltage, called overdrive (Chen, Pgs. 4-5 paragraph [0048]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to supply a voltage higher than the saturated drive voltage to the liquid crystal display as taught by Chen in the device of the AAPA in view of Tanaka in order to shorten the response time of the liquid crystal (Chen, Pgs. 4-5 paragraph [0048]).

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 1 and 3 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

## Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ke Xiao whose telephone number is (571) 272-7776. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30AM to 5:00PM. ·

Application/Control Number: 10/661,808 Page 5

Art Unit: 2629

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sumati Lefkowitz can be reached on (571) 272-3638. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

August 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2007 - kx -

SUMATI LEPROWITZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER